UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,033	03/12/2004	Ivan W. Pulleyn	INFOP004C1	6705

21912   7590   07/28/2008
VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. FOOTHILL BLVD #200
CUPERTINO, CA 95014

EXAMINER
LIN, KENNY S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2152	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *4/21/2008*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *13-23,36-46,59-96 and 103-111* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *13-23,36-46,59-96 and 103-111* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 13-23, 36-46, 59-96 and 103-111 are presented for examination. Claims 1-12,

24-35, 47-58 and 97-102 are canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 13-18, 36-41, 59-64, 70-71, 74, 77, 79-80, 83, 86, 88-89, 92, 95 and 103-111 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huitema, WO 99/27680, in view of

Wilson, US 7,127,471.

4.   Huitema and Wilson were cited in the previous office action.

5.   As per claims 13, 36 and 59, Huitema taught the invention substantially as claimed

including a method of providing an IP address for a host in a computer network, the method

comprising the steps of:

        a. A processor (computer is inherent to comprise processors) configured to:

            receiving, from a client in a computer network, at an appliance a request for an IP

address associated with a domain name (page 1, lines 19-21, 26-40, page 2, lines

5-6; receiving at local server);

b. Retrieving the requested IP address from a database associated with the appliance

(page 1, lines 28-33, page 2, lines 5-11, 20; local cache);

c. Transmitting the retrieved IP address to the client (page 2, lines 5-8).

6.   Huitema did not specifically teach to that the database is object oriented database and

domain name is associated with a zone wherein:

a. The object oriented data base comprises a zone object tree that includes a plurality

of zone objects, including a first zone object associated with the zone, wherein the

first zone object is linked to a second zone object associated with a sub-zone of

the zone;

b. The zone and sub-zone are associated with a logically hierarchical set of zone

information;

c. The object oriented database comprises a network object tree that includes a

plurality of network objects; and

d. The zone object tree and the network object tree are linked via a host object that is

associated with the domain name and the IP address.

7.   Wilson taught to use object oriented database development to manage very large

collections of information to represent the database as a collection of objects related by

inheritance (col.2, lines 42-50) and a domain name hierarchy reflecting zone and associated sub-

zone objects of a domain name comprising zone object tree that includes zone objects, a network

object tree that includes network objects; and the zone object tree and the network object tree are

linked via a host object that is associated with the domain name and the IP address (fig.4; col.7,

lines 23-42).   One would have been motivated to modify Huitema's database with an easier

administering database similar to the object oriented database and management method taught by

Wilson (see Wilson, col.1, lines 12-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huitema and Wilson

because Wilson's teaching of domain name hierarchy using domain tree in object oriented

database enables Huitema's method represent the namespaces of the domain name as a collection

of objects related by inheritance.

8.   As per claims 14, 37 and 60, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as

claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema further taught the step of establishing communicative

coupling between a client web browser and the appliance (page 1, lines 26-29).

9.   As per claims 15-17, 38-40 and 61-63, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention

substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema further taught that wherein the

computer network comprises the Internet, an IP based computer network and an intranet (300,

fig.3, page 1, lines 19-21, page 4, lines 13-17).

10.   As per claims 18, 41 and 64, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as

claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema further taught that the appliance receives the request

(fig.1, page 1, lines 28-29, page 4, lines 13-19).

11.   As per claims 70, 79 and 88, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as

claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Wilson further taught that the operating system is derived from

a full operating system that includes the at least one software component (col.5, lines 45-47,

col.6, lines 16-27).

12.   As per claims 71, 80 and 89, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as

claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Wilson further taught that the at least one software component

includes one of the following: a driver or a utility software (col.12, lines 3-12).

13.   As per claims 74, 83 and 92, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as

claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema further taught that the network name-related

functionality comprises the DNS and the IP address comprises a requested IP address associated

with a host identified in a DNS request received at the appliance (page 1, lines 24-40, page 2,

lines 5-14).

14.   As per claims 77, 86 and 95, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as

claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema further taught that the appliance includes a DNS

server, a configuration server, a web server, a database, and/or a GUI (page 1, lines 24-40, page 2, lines 5-14).

15. As per claims 103-111, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Wilson further taught that wherein retrieving includes identifying a top level zone in the domain name and accessing a zone object associated with the sub-zone; identifying a sub-zone in the domain name and accessing a zone object associated with the sub-zone; realizing that a last term in a domain name has been reached and accessing a host object associated with the domain name (col.7, lines 23-42, col.8, lines 14-29).

16. Claims 19-23, 42-46 and 65-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huitema and Wilson as applied to claims 13, 36 and 59 above, and further in view of Frank et al (hereinafter Frank), US 6,832,120.

17. Frank was cited in the previous office action.

18. As per claims 19-23, 42-46 and 65-69, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema and Wilson did not specifically teach the system to further linking a host object with a network object and a zone object, the zone object is linked to another zone object, the network object is linked to another network object, unlinking an old network object from a host object; deleting the old network object; and linking the host object to a new network object and automatically updating the host object to reflect an

association with the new network object. Frank taught that custom objects can be programmed

and linked together to support applications (col.2, lines 6-15) and the links can be deleted, added

or reconfigured in real time (col.5, lines 54-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huitema, Wilson

and Frank because Frank's teaching of creating custom objects and linking objects enables

Huitema and Wilson's system to use custom objects to support system applications.

19.   Claims 72-73, 81-82 and 90-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Huitema and Wilson as applied to claims 13, 36 and 59 above, and further in view of

"Official Notice".

20.   As per claims 72-73, 81-82 and 90-91, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention

substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema and Wilson did not specifically teach

the appliance excludes a hardware component/communication port that typically is included in a

host computing system but that is not required to provide the network name-related functionality.

Official Notice is taken that the concept and advantage of eliminating or uninstalling unused

hardware component on a computer is well known and expected in the art. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the

teachings of Huitema and Wilson and further assemble a host computer with only the needed

components to reduce the cost of the system and further simplify the installations.

21.   Claims 75-76, 84-85 and 93-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Huitema and Wilson as applied to claims 13, 36 and 59 above, and further in view of Boden

et al (hereinafter Boden), US 6,832,322.

22.   Boden was cited in the previous office action.

23.   As per claims 75, 84 and 93, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as

claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema and Wilson did not specifically teach to provide an

interface for configuring the appliance. Boden taught to configure a DNS server system using a

graphical user interface (col.7, lines 19-35, 43-47). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huitema,

Wilson and Boden because the Boden's teachings of using graphical user interface for

controlling and configuring the DNS server enables Huitema and Wilson's system to access and

configure the remote DNS servers to avoid redundant copies of information contained (Boden,

col.7, lines 19-20).

24.   As per claims 76, 85 and 94, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as

claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema further taught to user client web browser to send

request to the appliance (page 1, lines 26-29). Huitema and Wilson did not specifically teach to

provide a web interface for configuring the appliance. Boden taught to configure a DNS server

system using a graphical user interface (col.7, lines 19-35, 43-47). It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of

Huitema, Wilson and Boden because the Boden's teachings of using graphical user interface for

controlling and configuring the DNS server enables Huitema and Wilson's system to access and

configure the remote DNS servers to avoid redundant copies of information contained (Boden,

col.7, lines 19-20).

25.   Claims 78, 87 and 96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Huitema and Wilson as applied to claims 13, 36 and 59 above, and further in view of Belzile, US

6,801,952.

26.   Belzile was cited in the previous office action.

27.   As per claims 78, 87 and 96, Huitema and Wilson taught the invention substantially as

claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema and Wilson did not specifically teach that the database

is an object oriented database. Belzile taught to store IP address in object oriented database

(col.5, lines 32-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Huitema, Wilson and Belzile and use an object

oriented database as the database disclosed in Huitema and Wilson's system to store and retrieve

IP address.

Response to Arguments

28.   Applicant's arguments filed 4/21/2008 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

29.   The applicant did not raise any arguments to pointing out how the language of the claims

patentably distinguishes them from the references. Wilson clearly teaches the newly added

limitations. See rejection above.

30.   Because Applicants have failed to challenge any of the Examiner's "Official Notices"

stated in the previous office action in a proper and reasonably manner, they are now considered

as admitted prior art. See MPEP 2144.03

Conclusion

31.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

32.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3968.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Kenny S Lin/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2152
July 27, 2008